

REMARKS

Claims 28-33, 35-36, 44 and 46-48 are pending. Claims 1-27, and 49-58 are withdrawn. Claims 34, 37-43, 45, and 58 have been canceled.

Support for the “upper and lower surfaces” limitations to claims 28 and 44 is found in as-filed Figures 5A, 5B and 5D.

Claims 28-33, 35-36, 44 and 46-48 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The Examiner has taken the position that the limitation “concave contour that is substantially parallel to the convex contour” is indefinite.

Applicants have deleted this limitation from the independent claims. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn as moot.

Claim 44 stands rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by US Patent No. 3,805,443 (Duncan).

Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 44 characterizes the first extension by four surface features: an upper end surface, a lower end surface, an inner surface having a convex contour, and an outer surface having a concave contour. These four surfaces are mutually exclusive of each other – that is, they characterize four distinct surfaces of the extension.

In contrast, the most straightforward characterization of FIG. 3 of Duncan is that it has convex upper and lower surfaces 11 at its upper and lower ends, and has straight inner and outer surfaces 17 on the right and left sides. Therefore, Duncan does not have an inner surface having a convex contour and an outer surface having a concave contour. Moreover, Applicant's are at a loss to understand how the surface most recently identified by the Examiner as the “concave surface” is on an “outer surface.”

For these reasons, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 28-30, 44, 46-48 and 58 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by US Patent No. 7,011,685 (Amin).

Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 28 and 44 characterize the first extension by four surface features: an upper end surface, a lower end surface, an inner surface having a convex contour, and an outer surface having a concave contour. These four surfaces are mutually exclusive of each other – that is, they characterize four distinct surfaces of the extension.

In contrast, the most straightforward characterization of Amin is that it has straight upper and lower surfaces, and straight inner and outer surfaces. The surfaces pointed to by the Examiner for their convexity and concavity are very small transition regions between the upper surface and the inner/outer surfaces that will exist on every single L-shaped design. Such regions can not be properly characterized as belonging to any of the upper surface, the inner surface or the outer surface. Therefore, Amin does not have an inner surface having a convex contour and an outer surface having a concave contour.

For these reasons, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 28-33,35-36, 38-39, 46-48 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 3,805,443 (Duncan) in view of US Patent No. 1, 985,032 (“Hoult”).

Applicants respectfully traverse. As discussed above, Duncan does not have an inner surface having a convex contour and an outer surface having a concave contour. Hoult has only been cited for its disclosure of a rivet and so does not cure the deficiencies of Duncan.

For these reasons, the rejection should be withdrawn.

In addition, please provide any additional extensions of time which may be necessary and charge any fees which may be due to Deposit Account No. 10-0750, but do not include any payment of issue fees.

Should there be any remaining or further questions, the Examiner is requested to place contact the undersigned directly.

Respectfully submitted,

/Thomas M. DiMauro/

Thomas M. DiMauro
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 35,490
Johnson & Johnson
1 Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ
(508) 880-8401